



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

assist-ant, consist-ent	glanders, glen
Aurangabad, Aurengabad	gradual, ingress
Aurangzib, Aurengzib	Granada, Grenada
Balize, Belize	+jealous, jealous
blab <i>Sc.</i> , bleb	labber <i>Sc.</i> , lebbier <i>Sc.</i>
bladoch <i>Sc.</i> , bledoch <i>Sc.</i>	Lan-caster, Chester
blanch <i>Sc.</i> (a ray), blenk <i>Sc.</i>	+lassen, lessen
blancher, bleicher	laverok <i>Sc.</i> , lerrick
blather, blether	manhaden, menhaden
Brackenridge, Breckenridge	miscre-ant, cred-ent, -ce
Bustamante, -mente	Navesink (N. Jersey), Nev-
chance, cadence	nuis-ance, noc-ent
chavender, cheven	parrakeet, perroquet
confid-ant, -ent, -ence	persist-ance, -ent
conniv-ance, -ent	+provand, provender
counten-ance, contin-ence	puiss-ant, pot-ent
crann-y, cren-ulate	rabbet, reb'ate
cross-jack, crojeck	rab-id, rev-ery
Damiata, Damietta	remn-ant, reman-ent
dan-delion, den-tal	resist-ance, exist-ence
dual, duel	resist-ant, exist-ent
eleg-ance, intellig-ence	snag (a cut), sneg <i>Sc.</i>
eleg-ant, neglig-ent	staddle, steddle
en-amor, en-emy	+stam, stem
fatten, fetten <i>Str.</i>	that, +thet
fasten, fest <i>Hlw.</i>	thous-and, +thus-end
f-lag(stone), (crom)lech	+thratte <i>Hlw.</i> , threaten
flat <i>Sc.</i> (floor), flet <i>Sc.</i>	wax <i>n.</i> , +wex
gag <i>Sc.</i> , geg	Yeman, Yemen

IV. — *On a Passage in Homer's Odyssey* (x. 81–86).

By LEWIS R. PACKARD,

HILLHOUSE PROFESSOR OF THE GREEK LANGUAGE AND LITERATURE IN
YALE COLLEGE.

ἐβδομάτῃ δ' ἰκόμεσθα Λάμον αἰπὺ πολίεθρον,
τηλέπυλον Λαιστρυγονίην, ὅθι ποιμένα ποιμὴν
ἡπίνει εἰσελάων, ὃ δέ τ' ἐξελάων ὑπακούει.
ἐνθα κ' ἄνπνος ἀνὴρ δοιοὺς ἐξήρατο μισθοὺς,
τὸν μὲν βουκολέων, τὸν δ' ἀργυφά μῆλα νομέων·
ἐγγὺς γάρ νυκτός τε καὶ ἡματός εἰσι κέλευθοι.

Od. x. 81–86.

THAT this passage was obscure and difficult to the early students of Homer appears from the number of conflicting explanations and conjectures suggested in the Scholia; and among modern commentators there is scarcely more agreement,

though the conjectures are less wild. I propose to state the difficulties and briefly describe the different theories of explanation, and to indicate in what direction the true explanation of part of the passage appears to me to lie.

The first question arises as to *Λάμου*—is it the name of a city or of a person? It may very well be the name of a city; there is in Strabo (xiv. p. 671) mention of a river and a village, both bearing the name Lamos, in Kilikia, and the construction, a genitive of designation or apposition, occurs elsewhere in Homer as well as frequently in later Greek. An example is Il. ii. 538, *Δίου τ' αἰπὺν ποτολίεζρον*. If we take it as the name of the city, the two words in the next line, *τηλέπυλον Λαιστρυγονίην*, may be regarded as adjectives agreeing with *πόλιν*, which is perhaps implied in *ποτολίεζρον*. Others understand *Λαιστρυγονίην* as a substantive in apposition to *ποτολίεζρον*, translating “to the city Lamus, to long-streeted Laestrygonia,” in which phrase two names for the city are given. These are awkward, but perhaps not impossible constructions.

On the other hand, may not *Λάμου* be the name of a person, a former or the then reigning king of this land? This view likewise was taken in ancient times, and the Scholia even tell us that he was a son of Poseidon. It is difficult to find the origin of that statement, as this seems to be the only passage of Greek literature before the Christian era in which the name occurs. Probably the guess was suggested by the similarity in character of these Laestrygonians to the *Kyklopes*, who are some of them described in Homer as descendants of Poseidon. If *Λάμου* is the name of a person, it would apparently be some former king or eponymous hero of this tribe, as lines 106–111 below refer to one Antiphates as king at the time of this visit.

Then, if *Λάμου* is the name of a person, the next point of variation in the Scholia is as to *τηλέπυλον*—is it an adjective, or a substantive, the name of the city, and so to be printed, as Dindorf prints it, with a capital T? They differ also as to the meaning of the word as a compound (whether substantively or adjectively used in this place); is it “having

gates far apart, distant from one another," or is it "having large gates, wide and high"? This latter view is taken by two modern editors, Ameis and Hayman, on the ground that such gates belong to a city of giants and where two flocks at once pass through the gates—an idea which is by no means clearly expressed in the passage. But they give no example to support this meaning, and I find no other compound of *τῆλε* having such a sense. It always has the meaning "distant, far" and never that of "large." For "wide-gated" we have *εὐρυπυλῆς* (Od. xi. 571); for "high-gated" the Scholia on this passage use *μακρόπυλος*. It seems then that *τῆλεπυλος* should mean "having gates far apart," a description of a city either, as Nitzsch understands it, "with long streets" and gates at both ends, a length measured on a diameter, or, as perhaps is more natural, measuring the length on the circumference, with a long stretch of wall between its gates and so "large in circuit." The word occurs, I believe, nowhere except here and in Od. xxiii. 318, in a reference to this same city which occurs in a summary of the wanderings of Ulysses, but that summary, though a part of the poem in the time of Aristotle, for he (Rhet. iii. 16) refers to it as an example of successful condensation, is of doubtful genuineness in the view of modern critics. At any rate, it gives no real help to the understanding of this passage. On the whole, it seems that there are no sufficient data for a positive opinion on the questions raised in regard to this first line and a half.

We come now to the rest of the passage, which is evidently all one thought. The different items are parts of one fact in regard to this city, one distinguishing peculiarity, which the poet labors to make clear to us. The translation seems easy—somewhat as follows: "(a city) where one shepherd coming in hails another, and he going forth answers; there a man who needed not sleep could have earned double wages, one by herding cattle, another by tending sheep, for near are the paths of night and day."

The ancient comments upon these lines hardly deserve mention—certainly not the labor of refutation. One refers the description to the neighborhood of Leontini in Sicily,

where, he says, the flies were so troublesome that the cattle could not be pastured in the daytime, whereas the sheep being defended by thick fleeces could be; and so the line referring to the different flocks is explained. Another supposes that the day and night pastures were different ones, but near to each other, so explaining the last line. Another, that the suburbs of the city were uncultivated, and so used for pasture land; and thus that a herdsman, not being obliged, as in other cities, to go to distant hills, might be able to go out twice a day with different flocks. It is plain that all these are mere conjectures, and some of them very unsuitable ones. There is a nearer approach to the probable truth in a suggestion attributed to Krates, the grammarian of Pergamos in the 2d century B. C., who thought that the whole account referred to some region of short nights. He is quoted as saying that they lived "about the head of the dragon," that is, in the region apparently under the constellation so named, "of which," Krates continues, "Aratus says 'that head will move there where risings and settings are closely joined together.'" It will be observed that this statement of Aratus has no reference to the passage in Homer. It is only the authority of Krates therefore, and not that of Aratus besides, that we have for this interpretation. He understood the phrase of Aratus as applying to the Laestrygonian country. Krates goes on to explain that since the outgoings of day and night were so near each other, the night must be very short and so a man who could dispense with sleep could earn double the pay of him who must spend a part of every day (of twenty-four hours) in sleeping.

We now turn to the opinions of modern commentators, for the fullest account of which I depend upon a young German scholar, now dead, J. F. Lauer, the first volume of whose literary remains (Berlin, 1851) is occupied with Homer. It is not however worth while to enter into all the conflicting and in many cases obsolete explanations which he discusses. I refer to his essay only as containing the best *resumé* that I have found of the various opinions; but I shall confine

myself here to the views of recent scholars, mentioning enough to show the differences among men who all have the same general principles of criticism. Völcker (in his *Homeric Geography*. Hannover, 1830) perhaps hardly comes under this category, but his idea may begin the list. He supposes that the Laestrygonian city lay near sunset, or the entrance to Hades, and on a high mountain (*αἰπύ*); that the Greeks had noticed that sunrise came earlier and sunset later upon such mountain tops, as for instance upon Athos; and so that this city had a longer day than any other place and of course a shorter night. This idea that the city was on a high mountain is plainly inconsistent with the subsequent story in the *Odyssey*, and as to the rest of the theory the prolongation of day on a mountain top is hardly sufficient to suggest this exaggeration of it. Another idea is that of Klausen (*die Abenteuer des Odysseus aus Hesiod erklärt*. Bonn, 1834), that the day and night are spoken of as beings, not periods of time, that the western home of day was close by the Laestrygonian land, and that where the day was, it must be always light. This seems to be a step in the right direction, but does not cover the whole ground.

Nitzsch (*Commentary on Odyssey i.-xii*. Hannover, 1826-40) seems to have been the first to discuss the meaning of the passage in a simple and thorough way, introducing hardly any conjectures and explaining the whole as a whole. He assumes simply these two points, that the herds are driven forth in the morning and home at evening, and that the cattle are driven out earliest in the morning, the sheep come home latest at night. Where he gets this last idea I do not know; it may be so in fact in Germany or elsewhere, but I do not think there is any trace of it in Homer, nor does Nitzsch himself support it by any passage or speak of it as anything but an assumption. The passage then means in his view that the interval is so short as practically to disappear; the sheep-herd coming in at the end of his day meets and hails the cow-herd going out at the beginning of his, so near to one another are the goings forth of day and night. Thus a man who could dispense with sleep might go right out

again with the other herd and so earn double pay. In support of this view he thinks it necessary to argue at some length that the word κέλευθος means in Homer not *way, road*, but the *act of going*, or, as he translates it, *Lauf, Fahrt, Fortgang*. His translation of the last line he defends by the authority of Eustathius (who however is not earlier than the twelfth century of our era), quoting from him as follows: ὡς ταχὺ μετὰ νύκτα τῆς ἡμέρας διαφαινούσης — ὁ παραφράζων "Αρατος ἔφη τό· μίσιγονται δύοσιες καὶ ἀνατολαί. But, as we have already said, there is no indication in the poem of Aratus that this Homeric passage was in his mind. The connection is due to Krates only. The order of the words in the fifth line, Nitzsch adds, is to be explained by the fact that he would naturally mention first the herd that went out first in a given day.

With this explanation Faesi, the most judicious recent editor, in the main agrees, adding only the unimportant and apparently groundless conjecture, that the cow-herd would go out by the eastern gate, as the sheep-herd came in by the western.

The only other view that seems to deserve mention is that of Lauer in the book already referred to. He explains the third line as meaning that the sheep-herd coming in greets the cow-herd going out, and that this act of meeting occurs at evening. The reason for these opinions he finds in ἄνπνος ἀνῆρ (for the time) and (for the order of meeting) the correlation of clauses in the third and fifth lines (a sort of *chiasmus*) — which are plainly inadequate proofs. The last line he translates as others have: "near to one another are the goings forth of day and night." Now he denies that the whole passage has any reference to the short nights of high latitudes; for his whole treatment of the subject is designed to combat the idea of any knowledge in the genuine Homer of the north of Europe. He supposes the poet to imagine this people as living very far from Greece, near the place to which the sun makes his daily journeys — so near that the day lasts much longer for them than for other people — but to imagine also, half unconsciously, that the sunrise occurs to them at the same time that it does to all the rest of the

world, so that, the day being prolonged indefinitely towards its close, but not cut off equally at its opening, sunrise follows almost immediately upon sunset. They have indeed a night (*νύξ*, line 86), but the word means only the interval, however short it may be, between sunset and sunrise. As to the question how the sun gets back in time to rise in the east, Lauer says, as others have often said, that in such popular fictions we ought not to demand logical consistency or the carrying out of an idea through its results (*weder Konsequenz noch Durchführung*). The imagination does not act logically; it views one thing at a time, and catches an idea without troubling itself as to contradictions between different partial representations. There is nothing in Homer as to the journey back of the sun from west to east; the myth of the voyage on the Ocean-stream in a golden boat is of later date.

Now I wish to present a view of the passage which differs in one or two points from any of these mentioned, and which seems to me to involve less of assumption and to agree better in one respect with the use of language elsewhere than any of them. I say nothing about the first line and a half, because, as already suggested, there seem to be no sufficient data for a positive opinion as to the precise meaning.

Let us assume, as naturally taken for granted in the mind of both poet and hearers, only this one thing — that herdsmen and flocks usually spend the night, that is, generally speaking, half of each twenty-four hours, in the fold, and the day only in the pasture. This is the representation in Homer in other cases. In that of the Cyclops for instance, in the ninth book, it appears as his habit to spend the night with his flocks about him in his cave, and to drive them out to pasture every morning (*Od. ix. 216 f., 233 f., 307-15, 336-9, 405, 437 ff.*). So too in that of Eumæus, the swine-herd of Ulysses (*Od. xiv. 13-22, xvi. 3*). An apparent exception, in the famous simile at the end of *Il. viii. (555-61)*, where the shepherd is spoken of as rejoicing in heart at the sight of the stars, ceases to be an exception when we remember that the shepherd's hut about which the flock would be folded might often be in the open country, perhaps on a hillside, where a wide view of the stars would be had in the evening.

Now to apply the assumption based on these passages to the case in hand. Neither man nor animal spends all the time in the field, because of the need of sleep on the part of the man, and of protection from wild beasts or from wandering astray on the part of the animal. In a country not fully cleared of wild beasts nor fenced off into pasture fields, as Greece was not in the Homeric period, such is the necessary custom. So in the mind of the poet the idea of bringing in the flocks to the hut or to the town is naturally, we may say unconsciously, applied to Laestrygonia as it would be in any other case, from the usage with which he was familiar. Still if a man could dispense with all sleep he could there be out all the time, on account of the extreme shortness of the interval between sunset and sunrise. Yet it would not necessarily follow in the poet's mind, that a flock or herd could do the same thing, and so the double pay would have to be earned by bringing in, say the cattle for their milking and indoor time, and immediately taking out a flock of sheep for the rest of the long day. This explains the mention in the fifth line of the two kinds of animals to be tended by such a sleepless man. Thus too we understand the meeting at the gates mentioned in the second and third lines, of the outgoing and incoming droves. Nothing indicates whether cattle were going out and sheep coming in or *vice versa*, because each of these suppositions would be true at different times in the day and the description here takes the most general form. Nothing is said of its occurring at morning or at evening, for it might not be exactly at either. At certain intervals in the day of nearly twenty-four hours of light, without definite fixing of the intervals, without anything more scientific or positive than a play of the imagination, such a meeting, in whatever order, would happen.

The explanation of this strange phenomenon is in the last line, and the one point in it which gives room for uncertainty seems to be the first word, *ἐγγύς*. This word is generally understood, as we have seen, according to the idea of Krates (2d cent. B. C.) and Eustathius (12th cent. A. C.), as meaning "near to one another." Now *ἐγγύς* is used some forty-five

times in the *Iliad* and *Odyssey*, and generally with reference to a subject in the singular (e. g. *Il.* iv. 496), often with also a dependent genitive expressing that to which the subject is near (e. g. *Il.* vii. 225, *στῇ ῥα μάλ' Ἑκτορος ἐγγύς*): In eleven cases of these forty-five (not counting the one under discussion) it refers to a dual or plural subject and has no dependent genitive (*Il.* iii. 344, x. 113 *τῶν γὰρ νῆες ἔασιν ἐκαστάτω, οὐδὲ μάλ' ἐγγύς*, 221, xi. 340, xviii. 586, xxi. 285, xxiii. 378, xxiv. 365, *Od.* ix. 166, x. 30, xxiv. 494); that is, it appears in the same situation as in x. 86. These cases then are the only ones which can illustrate the use of the word there, and in all of the eleven except one (*Il.* iii. 344 *καὶ ῥ' ἐγγύς στήτην διαμετρητῇ ἐνὶ χάρῳ*) it must mean "near to something" mentioned in the context, not "near to one another." It thus appears that the usual sense of the word *ἐγγύς*, without *ἀλλήλων*, is that of simple, not reciprocal, nearness to something expressed in an adjoining clause and so easily supplied. So the less frequent collateral form *ἐγγύς* is never used in Homer of a plural subject and without a dependent genitive, and never in a reciprocal sense. The true word for reciprocal nearness is *πλησίος* in the dual or plural, and sometimes in the singular as an adverb, with or without *ἀλλήλων*. It occurs some twenty-seven times, of which eight are in the plural or dual with the reciprocal and two with the single sense, four in the singular with reciprocal and thirteen with single sense; but of these thirteen, nine are repetitions of the line,

ὦδε δέ τις εἵπεσκεν ἰδὼν ἐς πλησίον ἄλλον,

so that throwing out this line, we have twelve cases in all numbers of the reciprocal and six of the single sense. Now with this preference of *πλησίος* in the sense of reciprocal nearness and *ἐγγύς* in the sense of simple or single nearness, it seems that we ought to prefer for *ἐγγύς* in this passage the usual sense, in which some of the Scholia take it; and then what is the implied object to which the subject is near? Plainly we should translate "near to the home of the Laestrygonians are the paths of day and of night." When we follow the narrative on, we find that this idea accords entirely with the subsequent representations. The next

place to which they come, without any mention of time taken for the passage, is the Acaean island, home of Kirke, a daughter of Helios. It appears that this island was not more than a day's sail from Laestrygonia in the poet's imagined geography, for in line 116 there is mention of a *δείπνον*, the morning meal, their flight is immediate, and no mark of time intervenes before their arrival at the island. Now at this island, as we learn from xii. 3 f., are "the home and dance rings of Eos, the dawn, and the risings of Helios." Less than a day's sail from there but on the farther side of Oceanos is the land of the Kimmerii (xi. 11-19) where perpetual night prevails, for the daily journeys of Helios are bounded by the Ocean stream. When the wanderers after returning from there leave Kirke's island they come speedily (xii. 166) to the island of the Seirens, and on the way the sun is so hot as to melt wax (xii. 175 f.), then immediately (xii. 201) to the abode of Skylla, then again immediately (xii. 261) to the island of Thrinakie, where are kept the cattle and sheep of Helios, guarded by his two daughters, Phaëthousa and Lampetie. All these wonders come in one day's voyage (xii. 284-93) from the island of Kirke. This whole account bears upon the line we are discussing. It represents this part of the journey, separated by six days' sail on the one side from the island of Aeolus and by nine days' sail on the other from the island of Kalypso, as spent in a region of marvels which is so because of its nearness to one of the abodes of Helios, or because, in other words, it is on the confines of the known world, at one end of the day. It is impossible to make out a consistent system from the fictions of the story-teller's imagination. He seems to have a dim idea that if one should travel west far enough he would come to a world of wonders, to the place of sunset itself, and that somehow he would find there sunset and sunrise not as far apart as they are in the ordinary experience of men. Certainly it would seem natural that to one travelling so far west the day would be indefinitely lengthened at the latter end, and the logical consequence, that it would be shortened at the beginning, might easily not have been thought of.

Yet, in spite of Lauer's arguments, we can hardly think it impossible that the idea of such short nights was suggested by the stories of wandering Phœnician or Greek navigators. Some may have gone far enough north in the Euxine or outside Gibraltar to have observed the shortening of the nights, and these stories may easily have been exaggerated by the popular imagination into such a form as this—just the form into which such exaggeration would naturally fall without knowledge of the facts which we know of the polar regions. They did not think of the night or day as lasting continuously for months, but only of the indefinite extension of what they had observed, the lengthening of the day to the extreme limit of the twenty-four hours.

The points in which this explanation differs from most other recent ones are two: 1st. The accounting for the mention of both sheep and cattle in the fifth line by the general habit of having each kind of animal at home half the time; 2d. The translation of *ἐγγύς* in the sixth line "near (to Laestrygonia)" instead of "near to one another."

V.—*On Numerals in American Indian Languages, and the Indian Mode of Counting.*

By J. HAMMOND TRUMBULL,
OF HARTFORD, CONN.

THAT "all numerals are derived from the fingers"¹ is as generally true for languages of the new world as for those of the old. The North American Indians have, with comparatively few exceptions, adopted *decimal* systems, reckoning the fingers of *both* hands. Some South American tribes have not advanced beyond a *quinary*; and a few are said to be poorer even than this. The Brazilian Tupis had, at one time, no names for numbers higher than 3,² and the

¹ "Alle Zahlwörter gehn aus von den Fingern der Hände."—Grimm's *Gesch. der deutschen Sprache*, i. 167.

² The fact that the Tupis *lost* their names for 4 and 5, after the coming of Europeans, is worth noting. J. de Lery, who was in Brazil in 1557, writes that the "Tououpenambaults . . . usque ad numerum *quinque* verbis notare, hoc